

The Sun

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 5, 1901.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.
 DAILY, per month, 50 cts.
 DAILY, per year, 5.00.
 SUNDAY, per year, 1.00.
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, per year, 6.00.
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, per month, 70 cts.
 Foreign to foreign countries added.
 THE SUN, New York City.

PAID—Kingside No. 12, near Grand Hotel, and
 Kingside No. 10, Boulevard des Capucines.

For friends who have sent us manuscripts for publication with the usual request that we return them, we must in all cases send them for that purpose.

Still on the March.

The great rise of the last few days in the value of the properties dealt in on the Stock Exchange deserves deeper consideration than a mere upward movement of speculation.

Barely a month ago Wall Street experienced the most violent fall in the quoted prices of these securities that it had ever known. So far as mere decline in price was concerned, all other financial panics in our country were child's play; and by the precedents of the past a weary period of depression, more severe in the same manner than any previously recorded, should have followed. Yet to-day the stock prices of railroads and manufacturing corporations are back again to a level but a trifle below the high point touched before the panic day.

What is the meaning of this? It means that business in this country is stronger than the most radiant optimism dreamed, stronger even than panics, and that our country's imperial march along the industrial road is still under full headway, the obstruction great enough to stay it not having yet been raised.

What's Wrong About Labor Unions?

This letter deals heatedly with a subject which should always be approached with judicial calmness, from whichever side it is regarded, for it is of momentous importance to mankind.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: To-day's SUN contains some news from Pittsburgh, to the effect that the Reformed Presbyterian Synod regards labor unions as evils to society. And that is about the way you regard them, why you so persistently, yet covertly more often, direct your efforts as against them.

No doubt, this body of religious donkeys will later on discuss means of bringing the people more toward the Churches. And you would, of course, report their deliberations and perhaps give them editorial assistance in your usual discerning and wise way. It is clearly evident that those who hold high place in the Churches, and some who sit in nicely upholstered chairs in editorial rooms do not feel well at ease in common with those who do actual work yet aspire to better conditions.

When capital organizes it is called progress. When labor does the same thing Synods and editors treat it as a matter of social distinction. What's wrong about labor unions? Where would labor be to-day but because of them? Why should preachers and editors give in the way of progress in this direction? They know why, and working people are no fools too intelligent not to understand.

Capital will concentrate, as a matter of evolution, its power on the few who are the country's going to get together for the same reason, and for the same reason labor unionism is going to grow and get strong. In spite of all opposition by editors and others supposed to be better employed when dealing with matters more strictly spiritual. The world is tending toward the better, and its progress cannot be stayed by editors and ministers of a gospel that has been absolutely tried to sweep back the world with a very common and insignificant household implement. Curb your bitterness toward labor unionism. If you can, and nobody will intrude while you indulge with such great care your rapidly developing animosity. The working people, after all, quite a big slice of society, and society is not going to wait till you do. MACHINIST.

THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN Synod's attitude toward labor unions was simply a consequence of a distinguishing and fundamental article of its faith, or "testimony," so called. This Synod is a small branch of the Presbyterian family, and one of its principles has always been opposition to "all secret, oath-bound societies" as contrary to its views of the law of CHRIST. Accordingly the Synod, classing labor unions among such societies, passed a resolution, the other day, reminding its members that they are prohibited by their religious principles from joining such a union. This was only consistent with its teaching and imposed no constraint on the will of anybody, for acceptance of the Synod's rules is purely voluntary. People who are in labor unions or want to join them are free to leave the society of the Reformed Presbyterians.

So far as THE SUN is concerned, the language of assault used by our New Haven correspondent is wholly unjustified. We have never denied the right of labor to organize in labor unions, but rather have always asserted it as indisputable. Instead of exhibiting any "hostility to labor," we have always contended for the rights of labor, whether organized in unions or independent of them. It is true that "the working people" are "quite a big slice of society," they are more than a slice, for they constitute nearly the whole of society; and we are only hostile to the use of any machinery of organization to interfere with their liberty of working by menacing them with penalties for refusing to submit their wills to it. The great majority of "working people" thus refuse. The minority who render such submission voluntarily are entirely within their rights; but it is intolerable despotism for them to interfere with the majority's right to work independently and to get employment when and where they can at such prices as they are willing to sell their labor at.

What's wrong about labor unions?

What's wrong about labor unions? asks our correspondent; "where would labor be but for them?" Unquestionably labor unions have been influential in raising the scale of wages, and, so far, they have proved beneficial to those who are combined in them. Their organization, too, has been inevitable under the circumstances, but all the same, fundamentally and irremovably, they wrong the workmen.

While gaining better wages the labor union man has been compelled to surrender a priceless privilege, or his individual initiative, his very individuality, and to level himself to the mass in his trade, however superior his ability. This is a great sacrifice, and it tends to the building up of a caste which violates the healthy law of human progress and is inconsistent with our social and political principles. It cannot be denied that the workman is between the upper and the nether millstone.

On the one side are employers who are capable of seizing every opportunity to depress their pay; and, on the other, they are restrained by the labor union combination from the free exercise of their individual abilities and relegated to a caste in which it tends to fix them permanently. This is a terrible alternative. Freedom in their birthright and they cannot give it up for temporary material gain without sacrificing a right whose jealous preservation is essential to the dignity of their manhood and to the progress of society. The world moves ahead under the leadership and propulsion of superior ability; the march of the labor union is regulated by the average ability, even by the step possible for the weakest. It compels uniformity, while the law of progress requires that there shall be no constraint on using the diversity of individual gifts and abilities, so that the strongest and swiftest may be always in the lead. If there is constraint there is slavery, with consequent dwarfing and atrophy.

For example, a mason was employed in a certain large public improvement. He was a skilful man of superior ability at his trade, and in a week he was able to get through with a certain amount of construction. One day, he came to the superintendent and announced his purpose to throw up his job, and when asked if he had any fault to find with it or his wages replied that he had none, but that the delegate of his union had come round, inquired how much work he was completing in a week and told him that he must do a quarter less, in order not to "beat his mates." "That," said the mason, "is impossible for me; I am so built that I've got to do the best I can, and as I have a chance to get in my neighborhood little jobs of repairing and what-not, with which the union cannot interfere, I am going to leave." If that labor union rule had been imposed from the beginning mankind would still be in a state of savagery. Only by every man's doing the best he can has civilization succeeded and will it be carried forward; only so can necessary self-respect be maintained.

That is "what's wrong about labor unions," and it is a grievous wrong—a bar to the progress of humanity, a restraint upon liberty, a degradation of manhood. And that is why the majority of the "working people" are outside of the labor unions. They prefer their liberty. They prize the opportunity to exercise their abilities without restraint and take the chances. They want to do the best they can.

The great contempt of the labor union is not with capital; it is with labor relating its despotic domination.

Is the Chinese Problem Solved?

The Chinese Imperial Government has accepted the demand of the Powers that the aggregate indemnity shall be fixed at \$50,000,000 taels. It has been repeatedly stated that this sum amounts in our currency to \$337,000,000; but, at the rate of 70 cents a tael, it would obviously be equivalent to only \$315,000,000. There has been, as yet, no agreement touching the particular revenue which are to be earmarked for the interest and amortization of the new debt. Nevertheless, the Powers seem to consider the Chinese problem solved, for the bulk of their troops are being rapidly withdrawn, although legation guards are to be kept in Peking and garrisons maintained in Tientsin and near the mouth of the Pei-ho River. As a matter of fact, however, the fundamental questions remain still unanswered, the questions, namely, whether hereafter the legations at Peking will be guaranteed against attack, and whether individual foreigners will be safe all over China. It is not even certain that the territorial integrity of China has been assured.

To take up the last question first, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that Russia is at this moment virtually the mistress of Manchuria as well as of the Liaotung peninsula. There is no reason to believe that she will withdraw any considerable fraction of her troops from this region until the Manchurian branch of her trans-Siberian railway shall have been finished; and, obviously, when the line is completed, she will have an even stronger motive for protecting it than she has now. Nor is this the only indication that projects of dismemberment have been by no means abandoned. According to a telegram printed in a London newspaper, France is preparing to annex at an early date the island of Hainan, which is of great strategic as well as commercial value. If these two Powers, in addition to their shares of the pecuniary indemnity, shall, under one guise or another, acquire territory also, what ground have we for believing that Germany and Japan will not follow the precedents thus established?

We reproduced on Monday the account published in the London Express of a very important interview with Sir ROBERT HART, the Chinese Commissioner of Customs at the treaty ports. Sir ROBERT, who, unquestionably, is the highest living authority on the relations of China to foreign Powers, does not hesitate to assert that the problem raised by the assault on the legations is far from solution. He pronounces the determination to fortify the legation quarter in Peking a mistake from strategic, political and social viewpoints. A mistake it is strategically, he thinks, because the Chinese will be able to capture the legations whenever they wish, notwithstanding the assistance that the garrisons at Tientsin and on the coast might be expected to furnish. Politically, the fortification of the legation quarter is described as a blunder, because the Powers ought to throw the burden of protecting that quarter of Peking on the Chinese Government itself by making it thoroughly understand that a legation is sacred ground. Socially, the transformation of the legation quarter into a fortress is stigmatized as an error, because it will humiliate the Manchu and Chinese inhabitants of the capital, and will aggravate the rancor with which they are disposed to look on foreign residents.

What renders Sir ROBERT HART's comments on the situation particularly discouraging is the fact that he practically admits not only that the Chinese problem has been left unsolved, but that it is insoluble. He does not point out how the representatives of the foreign Powers could have pursued a course wiser than that which they have adopted, except that they might have been more courteous in enforcing their ultimatum. He suggests that the foreign Ministers might have gone through the formality of pretending to consult China as to the particular officials to be punished, but he does not deny the truth of a statement made to him by LI HSI-CHANG that, if the Powers had not made out a list, and demanded that certain specified men should be beheaded, not one of them would have been punished. We

cannot see, therefore, that Sir ROBERT HART, in spite of his long residence in China and relatively intimate knowledge of the Chinese people, could himself have furnished a definite and satisfactory solution of the Chinese problem.

It looks to us as if the work of teaching the Chinese Government a lesson in international comity and decency might have to be resumed at no distant date. We fear that the "open door" may prove to be a dream, for the reason that the present Manchu Government of China is probably unworthy of the consideration and forbearance with which the United States and other foreign Powers have treated it. We fear that there are but two drastic solutions of the Chinese problem, to wit: the relegation of the task of imposing Western civilization on the Middle Kingdom to the Japanese; or else the parcelation of the whole empire among foreign Powers. We shall gain, no doubt, by the recent military and naval demonstration a certain amount of delay. But we have only scotched the snake, not killed it. The venom of Chinese hatred for foreigners seems to be as deep-seated, as pervasive and as active as ever.

Benevolent Intentions Misconstrued.

Mr. EDWARD R. DODGE is a persistent correspondent of THE SUN in a way quite voluntary on his part. His theme is the Administration's policy in Cuba. Mr. DODGE keeps asking questions with a now-I've-got-you air, accompanying his verbal requests for information with more or less polite innuendoes concerning the probability of our evading the same from lack of journalistic courage. For a time this is amusing. By way of example:

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: You were kind enough to publish the Platt amendment at my request, but I also hoped to have the pleasure to see in juxtaposition the Teller resolution. It was like pulling teeth to get the amendment, but it is a more difficult operation to get the Teller resolution. Are you afraid to see it in THE SUN? I fear so. 'If you see it in THE SUN, it's no' cum prout solis."

"But I do not expect to see that resolution in THE SUN. Would you like to disappoint me, Mr. Editor? You have not explained yet how the President became an 'agent' of Congress, as you said he was. Now what makes the Platt amendment a 'law'?"

It says the President "is hereby authorized" to order home our forces in Cuba when Cuba gives in to our demands. It does not say he is commanded or forbidden to act as the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. His desire his authority to order the army around from the Federal Constitution, does he not, Mr. Editor? Don't be secretive about this Cuban business.

"Let us have your authority for pronouncing the Executive the subordinate of Congress, and your reasons for declaring the Platt amendment a 'law,' controlling the President's action, or else deal honestly with your readers and let them see nothing in THE SUN but what is so."

"Cuba needs friends. She seems to have changed masters. The people of our country are her friends, but the McKinley party are her screaming enemies." "NEW YORK, May 23. EDWARD R. DODGE."

We cannot undertake to republish here for Mr. DODGE's benefit the well-known text of the so-called Teller resolution; we prefer to risk even his ingenious suspicion that THE SUN intends to conceal from the world the existence of that document. He is quite capable of following up his success with a demand for the full text of the Revised Statutes.

Nor can we hope to explain to Mr. DODGE's personal satisfaction why it is that in the execution of legislative enactments the President is the agent or instrument of the law-making power. If we should laboriously explain that to him, he would be as likely as not to rejoin by demanding triumphantly why ABEL didn't kill CAIN.

As to his last question, we are compelled to admit that if the passage of the Platt amendment to the Army Appropriation bill by both houses of Congress and its signature subsequently by the President do not warrant us in regarding that document as law, controlling the action of the Executive, we can give no good reason for our belief that the same is law.

THE SUN is conscious of no disposition whatever to dodge Mr. DODGE, or to secrete any part of the historical record from his penetrating gaze. As long as our patience and printer's ink hold out we should be charmed to furnish him with elementary instruction suited to his individual requirements—that is, if there were nothing else in the world to do.

A Noble Project.

Of the practical objects and scope of the "Rockefeller Institution for Medical Research," just projected by the enlightened munificence of Mr. JOHN ROCKEFELLER, not enough is known to give a clear conception of how far the results, in the near, or even remote future, will justify the expenditure of money and work involved in the present immature plans that have come to us. It appears at present that work is to be begun at once in existing pathological laboratories at Johns Hopkins University, Harvard, McGill, the University of Michigan, the University of Chicago, and at laboratories in New York, of which there are four connected with medical colleges in the greater city, and one connected with the Board of Health. The work is to be done by ten men, who are to be paid out of the preliminary contribution of \$200,000, and is to be entirely disconnected from teaching. The institution is not to be affiliated with any university. So far as known, the officers and directors are professors of pathology in Johns Hopkins, Columbia, Harvard and the University of Pennsylvania, with the director of laboratories of the Board of Health and some others connected with medical teaching. It is proposed eventually to have adequate buildings and equipment in the city of New York, where work will be done by pathologists under pay sufficient to command their entire time, and release them from any necessity either of practice of medicine or of teaching. If intelligently planned and executed by the best men engaged in pathological research, work done under such conditions can hardly fail to produce beneficent results. But, assuming that the endowment will be ample, the problem of organization and execution of such a project is difficult and complex. It seems to us not wise to begin detached work in different laboratories as a preliminary. Such work is always in progress to a greater or less extent; and no important investigations in any single line, indicated by the directors, can be carried out in this way as well as it can be done by a competent corps of investigators under one roof. The directors are well qualified by long training and experience to supervise the building and equipment of laboratories. This being done, one man of recognized and pre-eminent ability should be detached from all other affiliations and put in absolute control of the scientific work of the institution, untrammelled by details of financial administration. It would be easy to indicate a man who would be the choice, with

hardly an exception, of the pathologists of this country; and the university of a relatively small city could well afford a loss that would be so great a gain for a truly national institution.

The directors of the new institution may learn a useful lesson from the history of pathological laboratories in the city of New York. The Carnegie Laboratory struggled for years with equipment and funds insufficient even for teaching medical students. Its condition even now is not much improved. It was the first laboratory organized in the United States (about 1884) and still does not compare, in teaching facilities, with the laboratories of Columbia or of Cornell. These three laboratories are so fully occupied in teaching histology, pathology and bacteriology, that no original work is to be expected. The laboratory of the Board of Health has miraculously escaped the perils of practical politics for several years, but is in constant danger. If the Rockefeller Institution shall be sufficiently endowed to be absolutely permanent and shall be devoted exclusively to its objects, as they now appear, its establishment will be one of the most useful dispositions of wealth ever made in this country. It certainly may be expected to extend knowledge of the causes of disease and, as a consequence, of the means of prevention and cure of disease; it will educate boards of health and the people in the essentials of hygiene, and so Mr. ROCKEFELLER will have contributed more than his share to human happiness and progress.

The Fate of Joe Phillips.

Until JOE PHILLIPS fell into the hands of Charity, he managed to get along pretty well. He was only 15 years old to be sure, his father was dead, his mother in jail, and he had his two little sisters to support. But he got a job which paid him three dollars a week, and only took a part of each day. The rest of his time he put in selling papers and doing errands. He made money—enough money to pay the rent, clothe his sisters and himself, and keep all supplied with food. He asked nothing of Charity—had rather hazy notions about there being any such thing in the world, and didn't want it if there was.

But the Gerry Society found JOE out, and then his troubles began. The home he had kept together was broken up. He was deprived of his liberty, and formally arraigned in court. His little sisters were taken from him and put in an institution.

Following this came more days of detention. Then finally there was a ray of light. A gentleman in very comfortable circumstances wanted to give JOE a home that was what a home for so worthy a boy should be. He was to have good clothes, a chance for an education, light work, and a salary that would be put in a savings bank for him every week. Decidedly things were looking up for JOE.

Then again his path was blocked. The gentleman who would have done so much for JOE was not a member of the Church in which JOE was reared. Excellent and entirely conscientious people entered objections. Their motives were beyond question, but in a way it was rather unfortunate for JOE. He came back into Magistrate Pool's hands again for sentence. He escaped the State prison, only to get a sentence for an indefinite term of years in a reformatory. JOE, it seems, has got to reform. To be sure he will be rather handicapped surrounded by boys who are in the institution to which he is going because of their viciousness. But that is JOE's misfortune, and misfortune, since others began administering his affairs, has been rather common with him.

The Catholic Protector, in which this boy has been lodged, is an admirable institution. To it are sent depraved and incorrigible boys, as well as boys who are homeless and paupers. But surely JOE does not come under either of these categories. If he demonstrated anything while he was permitted to manage his own affairs it was that he was as far from depravity as it is possible for human nature to be. The resolute courage with which he attacked and overcame all opposing obstacles, and the single-hearted devotion and utter self-oblivion with which he cared for the helpless little ones left upon his hands, won the admiration of an entire city. He was not a pauper, because he earned his living and paid his way. He was not homeless, because he paid his rent on the nail every time it fell due.

Between the upper and the nether millstones of the Gerry Society and the Protector, JOE's splendid spirit and worthy ambition seem likely to be ground to rather fine powder. Deprived of his liberty, and clad in garments that signify viciousness, pauperism, or both—that is the reward JOE PHILLIPS gets for his brave and generous spirit as ever was shown by boy or man in all the history of life's bitter struggle.

The Constitution's Accident.

The Constitution has received her baptism of wreck also. She now equals in experience her transatlantic sister, the Shamrock, and her own two glorious predecessors, Columbia and Vigilant. In her case it was not a squall such as doubled up the Shamrock's masts, but a steady, stiff blow. The spars and rigging held on until nature overcame them. Then the topmast surrendered and next the mast and collapse was the word.

There will be much preaching, of course, against the extravagance of the size of the canvas carried by the Cup yachts this year, but while we do not deride it, it doesn't interest us. When the Vigilant's bowsprit snapped, and away went bowsprit and topmast both, the croaker class shook their heads and called her impossible. But a stouter stay carried her to victory; and she was the forerunner of other boats still faster and grander. So with the Columbia. Now it is the Constitution's turn.

The thing to do is precisely what will be done—a little stiffer spars, perhaps, stronger at the points most subject to strain, and whatever else experience shows to be necessary, and the Constitution will again be the thing of beauty that she was and the pride of progressive yachtmanship.

that he had not had enough of a bachelor's life and wrote to the young lady's parents that, on mature reflection, he had decided to remain unmarried and to give up the plan he had cherished of entering their honorable family. French gallantry, as many have said, is often a skin deep. A few days later by registered letter M. ITRIA demanded the return of the engagement ring and other presents.

Mlle. BOUTIER paid no attention to either communication from her recreant lover. Neither did she bring suit for breach of promise. Like a well-conducted young person, she at once accepted another young man for her parents proposed to her and married him. Whereupon M. ITRIA sued the newly wedded couple for his affections. The French law, as ungallant as the fickle dry goods clerk, has decided in his favor, for what does the Code Civil, Article 108, say? "Every girl made with a view to marriage shall be void if the marriage does not take place." A girl engaged to a Frenchman in France, therefore, must be prepared to return the engagement ring if she or he chooses to jilt.

BRANDY, Tex., May 31.—The deer well was bountifully stocked with deer at a depth of nearly 1,000 feet.—St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

"Duster" means dry—no oil. The tragedy of high hoping speculation came to dust is thus told again in the most fashionable dialect of contemporary stock lingo. On the whole, garden truck is probably a better speculation than oil.

The Hon. CARRIE M. TAYLOR has not lived in vain. Her forceful ideas have taken root in a strange soil. Some Potomac home bureau and square mile north from the reservation twenty-five miles north of Topeka the other day. They drove out the barkeeper of a saloon near the reservation. Then they drank every drop of whiskey and beer in the "joint" and went home rejoicing. They are going to continue their raids. Probably the Rum Power within twenty miles of the Potomac reservation is thoroughly pulverized by this time.

Go away from home to hear the news. The Hon. AUGUSTUS LAWSON of New York, described as "one of TOM JOHNSON's warmest friends," breathes these confidences into the ear of a Cleveland reporter:

"Down in New York State the people are watching his act with perhaps greater interest than it is being watched right here in his own home. They believe that he is a great man and destined to become greater. Even old-line conservative Democrats are becoming enthusiastic over Mr. JOHNSON. 'He's coming man,' they say."

Mrs. ANNIE L. DIOGS of Kansas also predicts great things for TOM. "It must be difficult for him to work with the eyes of millions staring at him."

The picture of the Independence printed on another page this morning shows her to be undeniably staunch on the wind. Strength and speed combined make winners.

HOW LITIGATION COMES HIGH.

Referee Caught Sharing in Stenographer's Fees—His Report Disallowed.

A report of Martin O'Brien as referee in passing the accounts of Charles C. Dickinson, as assignee for the benefit of creditors of Eugene M. Earle and William Pitt Earle, proprietors of the Arlington and St. James hotels at Richmond Springs, has been sent to the Supreme Court. The report was disallowed because the referee made a dicker with the stenographer to secure a share of the stenographer's fees in the case in addition to his own fees as referee.

The stenographer who gave up a share of his earnings was George A. Haynes, who had succeeded a prior stenographer in the case. Haynes testified that Referee O'Brien gave him to understand that he would not get the work unless he agreed to share the stenographer's fees. They amounted to \$2,448.96 and the referee got something over \$200. The referee found that Stenographer Haynes had got a check for part of his services he wrote to O'Brien:

MY DEAR HAYNES: Congratulations. Am damned hard up. Will you send me a check correct as to indorsement. I make \$137 folios 8-13, \$211.04, of which I have had \$296, leaving \$215.08. Send me check so that I get it to-morrow morning. Sincerely,
 M. O'BRIEN.

Referee O'Brien admitted getting the share of the stenographer's fees, but denied that the stenographer would be discharged if he did so. The referee, as plaintiff, entitled to \$21,049.96 of the Earle estate for expenses of administration, and himself \$1,800 for his services. The referee said he was appointed by Justice Kellogg in May, 1898, so that he has been three years in making the report. He said he had been charged for ninety-four days in considering the evidence and \$20 for the day of consideration.

When Justice Freeman set aside the report and disallowed the referee's bill it was contended that the referee having cost more than \$7,000 and occupied three years it would be just to let the referee litigants to require the case to be gone all over again. The Justice says that there is no reason to let the case go over. The referee, which should prevent the litigants' standing. The referee on his own statements, "showing that he is a conscientious and ethical of his profession and a total disregard of the consequences of his improper conduct."

Here is a sworn officer of the law who stands as judge of this court and makes a bill at the beginning of a case, and then the stenographer for a share of the stenographer's fees to be paid for copies of the testimony. That such an agreement constitutes wrongdoing on the part of the referee, tends to unduly prolong the reference, contributes to the expense of the case, and is a violation of evidence, casts suspicion upon the fairness and impartiality of the referee and is a fraud and an imposition upon the parties, needs no argument.

To sustain this judgment would be equivalent to notifying every referee that he is at liberty by exorbitant demands and secret reservations to enrich himself at the expense of litigants.

EX-CADETS OFF TO ECUADOR.

Two Talk of an Appeal From Secretary Root to Congress.

Four of the five cadets expelled from the United States Military Academy for insubordination sailed yesterday for Colon aboard the Panama Railroad steamship City of Washington. The young man who couldn't go is John A. Cleveland of Alabama, who got a despatch from his home on Monday night saying his fiancée was very ill. He left immediately to see her. Those who sailed are Berchie A. Mahaffey of Texas, Henry L. Bowley of Nebraska, Traugott Bowler of New York and Robert K. Kinton of Michigan. They are going to enter the engineering corps of the Guayaquil and Quito divisions, in Ecuador, under Major John Harman.

Bowley and Mahaffey said that they felt that they had been unjustly convicted and had been made scapegoats for the rest of the cadets. They said that in their interview with Secretary of War Root they were told practically that an example had to be made of some, as the infraction of discipline had been too serious to overlook; and that Bowley and his four comrades had been dismissed for the sake of discipline. The young men said they hoped Congress might take the matter up at the next session.

The Keynote of Woman's Progress.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: The saying of Miss Anthony quoted in your editorial of this morning is significant. It sounds the new keynote to the onward march of the woman movement in the new century. The keynote is the emancipation of woman and of man as well from the shackles of which all human bondage has grown—the primal fall which perverted her function of motherhood and made her the sex slave of the man is found in the story of the prenatal environment of Jesus. When woman shall attain the freedom of Mary the mother of Jesus "and her husband be as one flesh," a new order of human relations will begin in humanity and a new kind of man will be born like unto the son of Mary, who thereby will "become the first-born among many brethren."

NEW YORK, June 5. M. A. S.

"NON-ELECT INFANTS."

The Actual Teaching of the Reformed Confessions and Assemblies on the Subject.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Mr. E. W. Rich of Danbury, Conn., in THE SUN of Sunday has made several discoveries regarding my letter on "Elect Infants," printed in THE SUN on May 30. Among the brilliant examples of his logic is the following: "So the only way to escape the imputation that the creed teaches the damnation of infants is to hold that it teaches that none of the non-elect ever die in infancy! And this is just what 'Orthodox' does!" I have given the subject of logic some little attention, and can only say that if Mr. Rich so understands my letter, it seems that he comes very near to incurring the rebuke administered in his own peroration, with which I heartily agree: "When we carefully examine the facts, and then draw our conclusions from them, we get much nearer the truth than when, reversing all logical processes, we pick out a conclusion that is pleasing to us and then try to find facts to fit it."

What I said in my letter I consider an evident proposition, which may be readily verified: (1) that the elect, in the first place, the Bible Church, and their children; (2) that the Westminster Confession, in speaking of the process by which "elect infants" are "regenerated and saved," refers entirely to the children of believing and covenanting parents, who die in infancy; (3) that it utters no teaching whatever regarding the state of any non-elect "infants dying in infancy," nor does it teach that there are such infants. My letter was called forth, not by any conceit that "it is any more difficult or repulsive to believe that a deceased infant is hopelessly lost than any one else," to quote again from Mr. Rich, but because I desired to show that the Presbyterian Church cannot escape from the doctrine of "non-elect infants" by expunging, or altering an article which undoubtedly does not teach it. Whether there are "non-elect infants" or not is entirely wide of the mark. The question is: "Does the Westminster Confession teach that there are such?"

On this point I can do no better than to quote Prof. Benjamin B. Warfield of Princeton University. He says:

The Reformed Confessions, with characteristic caution, refrain from all definition of the negative side of the salvation of infants, dying such, and thus avoid the imputation of Scripture, contained in the common to the whole body of Reformed thought. . . . No synod probably ever met which labored under greater temptation to declare that some infants, dying in infancy, are reprobate, than the Synod of Dort. Possibly nearly every member of it held as his private opinion that there are such infants. . . .

But the fathers of Dort, with truly Reformed loyalty to the positive elements to do the election and salvation of infants, were not less true to the positive doctrine of infant salvation. . . . without a word of negative inference. "Since we are to judge of the will of God from His Word," they say, "let us testify that the children of believers are holy, not by nature, but in virtue of the Covenant of Grace in which they together with their parents, are comprehended, godly parents being bound to see that their children be brought up in the Lord, whom it pleases God to call out of this life in their infancy." (Article XVII.)

What has been said of the Synod of Dort may be repeated of the Westminster Assembly. The Westminster divines were generally at one in the matter of infant salvation with the doctors of Dort, but, like them, refrained from any definition as to the negative side. That death in infancy does not prevent the salvation of God's elect they asserted in the chapter which treats of the application of Christ's redemption to his people. . . . With this declaration of their faith that such of God's elect as die in infancy are saved by his own mysterious working in their hearts, although incapable of faith, they are content. Whether these elect comprehend all infants, dying such, or not—whether there is a class of non-elect infants, dying in infancy—their words neither say nor suggest. No Reformed Confession enters into this question: no word is said by any one of them which either asserts or implies either that some infants are reprobate or that all are saved.

In these days of a loose-tongued and ill-informed "liberalism," people do not hesitate to indulge in "criticism" of ancient writings without the slightest idea of the meaning and occasion of their composition. The expression, "elect infants," easily involves for such persons the idea of "non-elect infants" to match it. They seem to forget the conditions of religious thought in the seventeenth century, when the reformed theologians were anxious not only to formulate clean-cut statements of Christian doctrine, but also to avoid the teachings alike of Papists and "Anabaptists." Hence, against the Papal doctrine of baptism and regeneration, and the groundless accusations of certain heretics classed as "Anabaptists," they formulated the statements, Protestant in every sense, that infant salvation depended upon the sovereign Election of God, and is not conditional on the performance of any sacramental form whatsoever. This very protest is expressed in the famous "Declaration of Sentiments" of 1590, which, among the errors of "Antichrist," specifically condemns "his cruel judgement against infants departing without the sacrament; his absolute necessity of baptism."

Perhaps, when the Church of Christ is purged of the pestilence and affliction of "liberalism," it may be more possible to understand and glory in the dear old Gospel, for love of which the martyrs died, the Gospel which has been the lasting joy and constant theme of many a saint of God, "of whom the world is not worthy." We thank you for the talk of "Anabaptists," and will be blessed with a succor of ignorant criticism.

FLUSHING, N. Y., June 2.

Comptroller Coler to Take a Recession.

Comptroller Coler is going away on his vacation on June 17, first to Buffalo. When he comes back he will deny again that he is a candidate for the Tammany nomination for Mayor.

Ex Proprio Vigore.

Election day was coming fast. As through this glorious land there passed a man who would not speak of "let"; His issue bore this strange device:
 "Ex proprio vigore."

His smile was glad, but high and low, He talked of Porto Rico's woes, And like a silver clatter rung The accents of that well-worn tongue,
 "Ex proprio vigore."

In happy homes he saw the light Of household fires glow warm and bright, But he declared that all should mourn, And then he groaned his regular gro